



Minutes—October 8, 2015  
3:00 pm - Academic Affairs Conference RM 239

**Members Present:** Andrea Paganelli (for Marge Maxwell), Carl Myers, Gary Houchens (for Kristin Wilson), Amy Cappiccie, Eve Main, Kurt Neelly, Kirk Atkinson, Steve Wells, Carl Dick, Cathleen Webb (for Chris Groves), Lance Hahn, Eric Reed, Angie Jerome, Shannon Vaughan, Molly Kerby, Ron Mitchell, Andrew Rosa, John Hay, Laura Brigman, Zac Bettersworth, Richard Dressler, Carl Fox

**Members Absent:** Marge Maxwell, Kristin Wilson, Leyla Zhuhadar, Chris Groves

**Guests Present:** Julie Harris, Laura Upchurch, Danita Kelley, Merrall Price, Janet Applin, Bob Hatfield, Andrew McMichael, Tiffany Robinson, Melissa Davis, Sylvia Gaiko, Mark Doggett, Janet Tassell

Meeting presided by Chair Kurt Neelly

I. Call to Order

\*Neelly introduced Provost Lee; Lee thanked Eric Reed for accepting the Interim Dean position & Dr. Fox for his work as Graduate Dean for two years.

\*Neelly introduced Richard Dressler as Senate representative & Zachary Bettersworth as OCSE student representative; Neelly stated Gary Houchens was attending for Kristin Wilson.

\*Neelly motion to approve Graduate Faculty Report as consent item; passed.

II. Consideration of September 10, 2015 minutes \*Kerby/Jerome motion to approve; correction Laura Brigman was absent at September meeting; passed.

III. Committee Reports

a. Curriculum Committee

\*Reed/Wells motion to approve the consent agenda with move EDLD 722 and EDFN 744 course proposals to the action agenda; passed, 1 no vote (Mitchell).

\*Reed/Jerome motion to approve with friendly amendment changing prerequisite for EDFN 744 to permission of instructor and not permission of instructor plus a course; passed;

\*Reed/Main motion to approve EDLD 722 course revision which was not on the agenda at the Curriculum Committee so it was not on the GCC report originally; passed;

\*Reed stated withdrawing from the curriculum committee for the remainder of the academic year; new chair will be appointed; new member has not been appointed at this time; will be formalized at the next curriculum committee meeting.

b. Student Research Grants Committee-No Report

\*Hahn stated that the committee put together letters that went out to the students and gave them to the graduate school and the graduate school changed them; information was omitted and Lance Hahn's name appeared on the letter erroneously since the letter should

reflect the collective committee as a whole that created the letters;

\*Hahn questioned who is responsible for travel funding and how is decision made whether a student receives travel funds; Hahn recommends forming a Graduate Council committee to look at how the travel funding is distributed; Jerome concurred that confusion exists with distribution and selection;

\*Fox commented that forming a committee to look at the travel funding would be up to the new dean; no formal policy or criteria exists as to how the travel funds are distributed; allocations match the departments/colleges funding and only fund those individuals who are going to present or be an active participant; Graduate Council has no budget or funding and if the Graduate Council would like to distribute funding the body should advocate for a budget; the Graduate School travel grant budget from Academic Affairs is \$10,000 & another \$15,000 is added to that from the Graduate School operating budget; McMichael and Webb indicated that both PCAL and OCSE try to match the departmental funding;

\*Neelly concurred that Graduate Council does not have a budget but has been operating as if they have control over the Graduate School's funding; Fox repeated that Graduate Council could advocate for an independent budget separate from the Graduate School if they wanted responsible for research funding;

\*Reed stated that it is important to get funds in permanent budget lines; and there is a great need for more research funding;

\*Wells/Hahn motion that the Policy Committee and Dr. Reed consult to revise policy for student travel funding; passed.

#### c. Policy Committee

\*Carl Dick (reporting on behalf of Kristin Wilson) two items for review; Graduate Faculty Status revision was submitted & rejected by Provost Emslie to remove the 4 tier appointments and replace them with a contractual agreement when new hires come on that the Dean's would describe what Graduate Faculty means for that particular individual; Dick recommended granting Graduate Faculty status to new hires through the Dean's office for each college; would like input from Graduate Council about Graduate Faculty Status and what that would involve; Jerome explained that the Deans would decide if you would get Graduate Faculty Status when you obtain your position and you would keep it; Graduate Council would no longer vote on Graduate Faculty and Graduate Council would no longer; Vaughan what would happen if you were not granted GF status at time of hire? Jerome policy would need to address that scenario; Atkinson indicating Graduate Dean would not approve at all? Jerome correct; Price would there be any criteria or would it be the discretion of the college Deans? Dick loose criteria now would remain; Gaiko explained that the Senate Charter states that the Graduate Council sets the standards each Graduate Faculty must meet before being granted Graduate Faculty status; McMichael would colleges be able to set their own standards? Jerome correct, would need to petition for a change in the charter so that each College could set their own Graduate Faculty standards; Atkinson stated when he was chair of Graduate Council an situation arose that the program was unaware of a Graduate Faculty approval as a Dean sent in the criteria and that the Graduate School Dean should still sign off on Graduate Faculty; Price what if the college does not require a terminal degree? Neelly asked Gaiko if Graduate Faculty status was a credential checked by Academic Affairs for the official credentialing of faculty to teach graduate courses; Gaiko, yes; Jerome questioned if anyone ever denied; Atkinson, Vaughan yes; Vaughan concerned that Graduate Dean has no oversight; \*McMichael questioned what benchmarks are doing? Jerome committee has not check benchmarks; questioned what the issue is with the original policy; Fox we

are using the old graduate faculty policy which was eliminated with the approval of the new Graduate Council Guidelines in May; Webb Council of Graduate Schools policy; Fox they don't have one; D. Kelley concern that part-time faculty are credentialed by Academic Affairs before hired and don't have graduate faculty status until after hire; Jerome suggested a Graduate Council committee be formed to consider graduate faculty applications in the summer; Dick stated that Dr. Wilson proposed to remove the Graduate Council review of Graduate Faculty status and the Graduate Faculty Applications for status originate from the Department Heads and get the signature of the college dean and Graduate School Dean and not necessarily the Graduate Council; Fox this suggestion would not address the conflict with the Faculty Handbook; Jerome stated that the Policy Committee will devise a proposal to revise the Graduate Faculty Handbook Committee, Gaiko clarified that language would need to align to the Senate Charter, Graduate Council Guidelines and Graduate Catalog as well; Price does graduate faculty status expire? Gaiko thought this would be part of college dean's annual review; Hahn do you have to have status to be on a thesis committee; all yes; Fox outside people can be on a committee; Vaughan which is another reason that the Dean of Graduate School should have oversight; Applin explained additional process for EdD doctoral faculty status; Price discussed collapsing the four status; Upchurch offered that not only are graduate faculty serving on committees and teaching but also have the responsibility of advising; Upchurch some graduate faculty are only advising; Price opposed no expiration of status but would like another system rather than required reapplication; Atkinson don't want it to be punitive; Fox should consider an appeal process for faculty denied status;

\*Neelly requested student rep Hay be allowed to ask questions about undergraduates taking graduate courses as he has to leave; Hay questioned why addressing this issue; Jerome because no policy; Hay encouraged case-by-case option for undergraduate students to take graduate courses, minimum hours should not be relevant and should not be required; Kerby questioned if the issue was need to involve the instructor or record; Jerome agreed the proposed revision of the Undergraduate taking Graduate Course(s) policy meant to include the signature of the instructor of the course and lowering required undergraduate hours to 60 hours; Jerome indicated that Provost Lee would like the minimum hours to be 75; Hay stated that the policy should have a stipulation stating that if the student doesn't meet the minimum GPA and hour requirement, then appeal should be available; Neelly does JUMP student information need to be in the policy; Jerome no, JUMP is different; Applin most undergraduates who want to take graduate courses are in their senior year; Vaughan concern with lowering both the undergraduate GPA and the minimum hours; Kerby agreed; Jerome this is reason to add the instructor signature; Dick reason to lower GPA to 2.75 is that this is the Graduate School minimum admission criteria; Brigman advocated higher than 60 hours earned should be required before an undergraduate can take graduate course(s); Neelly how is dual or AP credit counted in this policy; Jerome it is in the undergraduate credit total; Reed concern that undergraduates need to know that only 12 graduate hours can be taken and applied to graduate degree; Dick policy committee was also proposing to omit that course must be closely related to their major as long as they meet the requirements and the instructor approves; Jerome would want to add the program coordinator approval as well so students cannot take excessive amount of graduate courses in a single program; Upchurch the Graduate School does not allow students to enroll in more than 12 graduate hours; Jerome does Graduate Council have a preference on the minimum requirements; Atkinson, Kerby minimum 3.0 GPA and 75 hours; policy subcommittee will submit a proposal for the next Graduate Council meeting.

#### IV. Report from Dean of the Graduate School

\*Fox stated the Graduate School was told that the International Enrollment Management office traveled to India for two weeks to recruit graduate students, calling it the India Pilot Project; some departments were consulted; 290 applications have been received, 110 have been admitted, 86 have been denied and are in a pending status and have not been notified of their denial, 4 have been denied due to an IELTS score being below 5.5, 90 are out for departmental review or are incomplete applications; most of the applications are for spring 2016 term in Computer Science and Engineering Technology Management program; normal application deadline is September 1 to process an international application; most of the students have IELTS score of 5.5 or 6.0; minimum IELTS score required to be admitted to graduate school is 6.5; most of the students in this pilot project have not met the required minimum score; an agreement has been made between the International Enrollment Management team and Computer Science department to accept these students on a conditional basis, condition is they must take Literacy 199 and take the GRE; we do not know how many will enroll for spring;

\*Doggett stated his program/department has received 70 applications; 50 have been denied for no GRE score, low GRE writing score, or not meeting the minimum IELTS score; 10 students met all conditions and admitted; 10 students were conditionally admitted; discussed concern with Raza Tiwana that students will not succeed in their program;

\*Applin questioned if Literacy 199 faculty had been apprised of this condition; Fox no idea; Price agreed that not enough sections to accommodate the influx of students and that course is not for international students; Jerome questioned ethical to admit students that are not prepared to succeed in the program, quantity is overriding quality; Applin agreed that the international students may also have restrictions placed on them by their governments; Cappiccie questioned if international students could be admitted conditionally; Fox yes they can; Jerome was advised last year that international students could not be admitted conditionally; Atkinson India recruitment looked at by IEM as revenue source while faculty view admission by whether student would be successful; Neelly questioned how much Dr. Doggett was included in the process of admitting these students; Fox stated the Graduate School was told to process the applications & not consulted; Fox read e-mail from Brian Meredith that stated at the end of the Spring 2016 semester the academic performance of these students will be reviewed and at that time the Department of Computer Science and the WKU International Enrollment Management team will determine whether or not these conditional admission requirements will be continually upheld for future applicants; Fox stated with would be a permanent admission change to the Graduate School and should be vetted by this body; Webb indicated most of these students will be non-thesis and would not stretch the faculty ability to advise; Webb traditionally India students in Computer Science program have been successful; Applin will this set a precedent for other colleges/programs to take these students; Applin CEBS cannot conditionally admit students; Neelly fearful that faculty being omitted from admission review process; Atkinson what happened to NAVITAS and why can these students not filter through that program; Fox no comment; Jerome concern that not enough Literacy 199 courses; Julie Harris clarified that the condition is to take the Literacy 199 course in the first term enrolled; Atkinson concerned that email states will review if the Graduate Admission standard will be changed for computer science only; Fox yes; Hahn questioned who conditionally admitted these students; Fox the faculty in the program; Fox stated India students that have denials pending are being held in hopes of finding another program that will conditionally admit them; Jerome sounds like pressuring other programs to take the denials; Price reiterated that Literacy 199 is not an international student course but NAVITAS and ESLI are options; Hahn questioned how the applications were sent to departments; Fox same as usual except the Graduate School minimums were omitted, typically the Graduate School would deny students who do not meet Graduate School minimum scores for IELTS, TOEFL or GRE; Hahn concerned that Graduate School being asked to overlook minimum admission criteria; Neelly suggested that someone from the International Enrollment

Management office come speak to the Graduate Council regarding this pilot program; Reed yes; Price confirmed that pressure to UC from IEM; Applin relayed concern of admitting/enrolling international students in online programs; Wells questioned if these students who do successfully complete the program will be employable; Webb yes; Atkinson so they will be able to communicate their discipline in English; Webb yes; Hatfield relayed former recruitment of international students to MBA has been somewhat unsuccessful and program admission criteria should not be relaxed; Brigman that weakening of admission criteria affects program credentialing; Hahn questioned if graduate school admission criteria were waived for Computer Science and Engineering Technology Management without the support of the Graduate School; Fox yes, however Graduate School does make exceptions at times but only with the support of the program; Hahn faculty may have been coerced, the outgoing Graduate School Dean is reading prepared statements; Hahn the Graduate Council needs to review and make a recommendation on this pilot program and recommended that any waiver of admission criteria or any future pilot program should be vetted by the Graduate Council before a group of students' Graduate School admission criteria are waived for any specific program; Webb suggested that the recruiters had difficulty recruiting qualified candidates, were pressured to recruit, and would not want the recruiters to be hampered by needing input by Graduate Council; Webb however the Graduate Council should be a part of the discussion; Price would Graduate Council override the departmental decision to participate in pilot programs; Vaughan would be good if IEM would apprise the Graduate Council of these types of recruiting events before they go; Fox relayed that the Graduate School created a list of programs that were given to IEM for recruiting but were unaware of the waiver of minimum admission criteria for Graduate School; Jerome encouraged review of the program and requested report of student outcomes in future terms; Hahn need to request that Graduate Council is involved; Atkinson questioned what will happen to students who perform poorly in Literacy 199 and anticipated more rule-bending will follow for other departments; Neelly offered to request IEM come to next meeting to discuss the pilot program; Fox if the program is successful it will lead to permanent minimum admission changes; \*Hahn/Jerome motion for chair to contact International Enrollment Management request someone attend the next Graduate Council meeting to give overview of the pilot program strategy, assessment, and expansion plans for other programs; passed; Reed asked if other recruiting events are planned and if other pilot programs will ensue this term or in spring; Fox did not know; Neelly asked Reed if he had any closing comments as the new interim dean; Reed requested assistance from Graduate Council in the transition.

V. Public Comments

\*No comment

VI. Announcements & Adjourn

\*Curriculum Committee Deadline is October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2015.

\*Kerby/Jerome motion to adjourn